

Remarks

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated July 28, 2008, where the Examiner has rejected claims 19, 21-30, 40 and 41. In the present amendment, claim 19 has been amended. Accordingly, claims 19, 21-30, 40 and 41 are pending in the present application with claim 19 being the independent claim.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 19, 21-30, 40 and 41 in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103(a) (Claims 19, 21-30, 40 and 41; Redford/Owens)

Claim 19, 21-30, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Redford et al. US Patent No. 5,711,672 (Redford) in view of Owens et al. US Patent No. 5,555,416 (Owens). As set forth in MPEP § 2143, in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-97 (2007) the Supreme Court identified a number of rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness which are consistent with the proper "functional approach" to the determination of obviousness as laid down in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1 (1966). The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The KSR Court noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are not obvious with respect to Redford in view of Owens because the combination of Redford with Owens does not disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of the amended claims. Though the following remarks are directed primarily to the independent claims, they apply with equal force to each of the claims which depend therefrom.

Redford describes a host device that recognizes an insertion of a storage media, searches for a file of a predetermined name in the storage media and automatically starts an application listed in the instructions in the file. To facilitate automatic detection of insertion of the storage media, the host device is installed during booting with an autostart driver, for example. (see Redford paragraphs 55-60). The autostart driver is primarily responsible for launching the execution of the start-up instructions that are in the file that are to be executed to start an application. (see Redford paragraphs 55-60). It comes as no surprise that Redford describes, for example, that the autostart driver seeks to identify a security key to ensure authenticity of the storage media then execute the sequence of application start-up instructions. (see Redford paragraphs 63-67). Thus autostart driver of the host device is primarily responsible for initiating the execution of the application start-up instructions. That is not the same issue addressed by the claims.

Independent Claim 19 is directed to a method of managing a plurality of user-selectable software programs for use with a computer device in accordance with a task disk control file contained on the storage media external to or removable from the computer device.. Amended Claim 19 includes the limitations of, “executing the selected one of the plurality of software programs by the task disk control file configured to provide commands to execute the selected one of the plurality of software programs” and “launching the selected one of the plurality of software programs in accordance with the software launching information on the task disk control file wherein the task disk control file is configured to provide commands to launch the selected one of the plurality of software programs.” Unlike the autostart driver of Redford that initiates the execution of the application start-up instructions, the task disk control file executes

and launches the selected one of the plurality of software programs according to the amended claim.

In the Office Action it was asserted that Redford described launching the selected software in accordance with the software launching information in Figure 1D, step 129 of Redford. Specifically, under Redford, in step 129, the autostart driver executes the command X:DISGO.BAT which executes instructions in application profile file DISGO.BAT of the removable storage media. Thus the Redford autostart driver at least executes or initiates the execution of the application in the storage media. Accordingly, Redford fails to describe “executing the selected one of the plurality of software programs by the task disk control file configured to provide commands to execute the selected one of the plurality of software programs” and “launching the selected one of the plurality of software programs in accordance with the software launching information on the task disk control file wherein the task disk control file is configured to provide commands to launch the selected one of the plurality of software programs.” Owens fails to teach or suggest the limitations discussed above which Redford fails to teach or suggest. Therefore, Redford and Owens, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 19.

Based on the foregoing, claim 19 should therefore be allowable over Redford and Owens. Further, since claims 21-30, 40 and 41 depend from claim 19, claims 21-30, 40 and 41 should also be allowable over Redford and Owens.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 19, 21-30, 40 and 41 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully submit that they do not acquiesce to any of the positions set forth in the Office Action(s). If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP

Dated: October 27, 2008

By: /Stephen C. Beuerle/
Stephen C. Beuerle
Reg. No. 38,380

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP
530 B Street, Suite 2100
San Diego, California 92101-4469
(619) 238-1900